

# The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage  
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 6  
No. 3



SUFFRAGE IS NOT A NATIONAL  
ISSUE

THE PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE

"AREA" MEANS NOTHING—BUT  
"POPULATION DENSITY"  
MEANS MUCH

WHY SUFFRAGISTS WOULD RATHER  
FACE LEGISLATORS THAN  
VOTERS

COURT REBUKES FIGHTING  
SUFFRAGISTS

MRS. WARD'S LEGISLATIVE  
TRIUMPH

VIOLENT DECLINE IN WOMAN'S  
VOTE

FLAWS IN FEMINIST LOGIC

SUFFRAGE "MISSTATEMENTS"

JANUARY  
1915



Subscription, \$1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1912, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

# National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

## OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.  
Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland, Me.  
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.  
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.  
General Sec'y, Miss Minnie Bronson.

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. James M. Codman, Boston, Mass.  
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.  
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.  
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.  
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.  
Mrs. Augustus Gardner, Washington, D. C.  
Mrs. H. E. Talbot, Dayton, O.  
Mrs. A. F. Jamieson, Lawrenceville, N. J.  
Miss Jane U. Rutherford, Richmond, Va.  
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.  
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.  
Mrs. Clarence Morgan, Burlington, Vt.  
Miss Mary L. Atwood, Madison, Wis.  
Miss C. W. Patterson, Macon, Ga.  
Mrs. J. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.

# State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

## CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.  
Vice-Presidents, Miss Elizabeth Burnell, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover, Mrs. Wm. B. Williams.  
Treasurer, Mrs. Albert S. Cooke.  
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Walter S. Schulz, Hartford.  
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Wm. T. Howe, 41 Lorraine Street, Hartford.

## DELAWARE

ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE, WILMINGTON  
Chairman, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.  
Recording Secretary, Mrs. David A. Reinhardt.  
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell.  
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

## GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Richard Cuyler King, Mrs. N. K. Troutman, Mrs. J. E. Peacock, Mrs. Walter Lamar.  
Secretary, Mrs. B. P. Sutton.  
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. S. C. Moore, Macon.  
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.  
Chairman Press Committee, Mrs. J. S. Birdsey.

## IOWA COMMITTEE

President, Mrs. Martin Flynn.  
Secretary, Mrs. Simon Casady, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

## MARYLAND

Office: Garrett Building, German and South Streets, Baltimore.  
President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Halsup Adams, Mrs. Arthur B. Kinsolving, Mrs. Michael Wild.  
Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot.  
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose.

## MAINE

President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Philip W. McIntyre, Mrs. David W. Snow.  
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.  
Secretary, Mrs. George S. Hobbs, 48 Neal Street, Portland.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Office: 615 Boylston Street, Boston.  
President, Mrs. James M. Codman.  
Vice-Presidents, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell.  
Treasurer, *pro tem*, Mrs. James M. Codman.  
Recording Secretary, Miss E. C. Post.  
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Boston.

## MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. E. Clark, Mrs. C. A. Kent, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain, Mrs. Joseph B. Schlotman.  
Treasurer, Mrs. James Coslett Smith.  
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.  
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

## MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. J. B. Gillilan, Minneapolis.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Walter Richardson, St. Paul; Mrs. Alfred Pillsbury, Minneapolis; Mrs. Edmund Pennington, Minneapolis; Mrs. E. C. Stringer, St. Paul.  
Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.  
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. Daniel R. Noyes, St. Paul.  
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.  
Treasurer, Mrs. H. L. Stevens, St. Paul.

General Secretary, Miss Rita Kelley, 331 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.

Executive Committee, Minneapolis, Mrs. J. S. Bell, Mrs. G. H. Christian, Mrs. H. C. Clarke, Mrs. H. Harcourt Horn, Mrs. L. K. Hull, Mrs. C. J. Martin, Mrs. J. H. MacMillan, Mrs. J. R. Marfield, Mrs. O. C. Wyman, Mrs. John Washburn, Mrs. C. C. Webber, St. Paul, Mrs. D. F. De Wolf, Miss Mary Davis, Miss Caroline Fairchild, Mrs. Emerson Hadley, Mrs. A. H. Lindeke, Mrs. J. E. Ricketts, Mrs. C. L. Spencer, Mrs. F. F. Wright.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. Thomas C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.  
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.  
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.  
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

## NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck.  
Executive Committee, Mrs. Henry W. Yates, Mrs. John C. Cowin, Mrs. J. W. Griffith, Mrs. W. H. Koenig, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Mrs. Gerrit Fort, Mrs. John L. Webster, Mrs. Helen Arion Lewis, Mrs. Arthur Crittenden Smith, Mrs. T. J. Mackay, Mrs. F. N. Conner, Miss Janet M. Wallace.  
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street, Omaha.  
Treasurer, Mrs. Frank J. Hoel, 110 South 34th Street.  
Mrs. J. W. Crumpacker, Special Representative National Association, 336 Bee Building, Omaha.

## NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.  
Honorary President, Miss Dayton.  
President, Mrs. A. F. Jamison.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Mrs. Cornelius Hook, Mrs. Thomas Craven, Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, Mrs. John R. Emery, Mrs. William J. Libbey, Miss H. O. Magie, Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Miss Clara Vezin, Mrs. Carl G. Roebing, Mrs. William S. Stryker.  
Treasurer, Mrs. George B. Yarde.  
Recording Secretary, Mrs. R. C. Maxwell.  
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. A. E. Pendergast.  
General Secretary, Mrs. Orville D. Oliphant.

## NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th Street, New York.  
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.  
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.  
Vice-Presidents, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achella, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. William P. Northrup.  
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.  
Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Loomis.  
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

## NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. C. N. Frick, Mrs. J. G. Gundersen, Mrs. E. B. Goss, Mrs. C. E. Wolf, Mrs. T. L. Belacker, Mrs. L. B. Dochterman, Mrs. H. C. Chaffee, Mrs. R. H. Board, Mrs. M. O. Movins, Mrs. C. W. Plais, Mrs. J. W. Reynolds.  
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.  
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

## OHIO

President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbot, Dayton.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman, Cincinnati; Mrs. Frank D. Jamison, Cincinnati; Mrs. Joseph A. Jeffrey, Columbus; Mrs. J. H. Upham, Columbus; Mrs. John Bradley Greene, Dayton; Mrs. Harry G. Carnell, Dayton; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. J. Herbert Roach, Cleveland; Mrs. Charles Orr, Cleveland; Mrs. Milton James, Austin; Mrs. Cyrus Newby, Hillsboro; Miss Alice Bennett, Chillicothe.  
Field Secretaries, Miss Lucy Price, Cleveland; Miss Clara Markeson, Columbus; Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.  
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 261 South Fifteenth Street, Philadelphia.  
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassat, Miss Grace Falkner, Miss Sophy Dallas Irwin, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. John Markoe, Miss Mary Newhall.  
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.  
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.  
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

## RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.  
Vice-Presidents, Miss Louise C. Hoppin, Mrs. Howard O. Sturges, Mrs. Stephen O. Metcalf.  
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.  
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard, Newport Branch.  
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.  
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.  
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

## VERMONT

President, Mrs. Clarence Morgan.  
Vice-President, Mrs. George W. Wales.  
Secretary, Mrs. M. H. Buckham, Burlington.  
Treasurer, Mrs. Clarence Morgan.  
Executive Committee, Mrs. G. G. Benedict, Mrs. Addison B. Buell, Mrs. Merritt D. Chittenden, Miss Bertha Terrill.

## VIRGINIA

President, Miss Jane U. Rutherford.  
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. William F. Gray.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Hunadom Cary, Mrs. Arthur P. Wilmer, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. James Lyons.  
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell, 1714 Grove Avenue, Richmond.

## WASHINGTON, D. C.

1402 H Street, N. W.  
President, Mrs. Augustus P. Gardner.  
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. John W. Weeks, Mrs. Douglas P. Birnie.  
Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Davis.  
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Esther Denny.  
Treasurer, Miss Alice Card.  
Executive Committee, Mrs. William W. Mathewson, Mrs. Frederick Keep, Mrs. E. Rollins Morse, Mrs. Swager Sherley, Miss Josephine Patten, Mrs. William Cogswell, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard.

## WISCONSIN

President, Miss Mary L. Atwood.  
First Vice-President, Mrs. Geo. H. Noyes.  
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Frank L. Vance.  
Secretary, Miss Gertrude S. Bean, 4 Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee.  
Treasurer, Mrs. Ella B. Usher.

## MUST ALL WOMEN BEAR THE BURDEN OF THE BALLOT TO GIVE SOME WOMEN POLITICAL PROMINENCE?

**T**HIS is the question raised by the President of the Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. The following extracts from her letter to the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America furnish startling testimony on the present tendencies of suffrage campaigning:

It is extremely significant that Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, in her most recent contribution to the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, declares: "I contend that we should not answer our opponents when they argue along these lines, because Facts As To The Results of equal suffrage, or the Number of Women Who Want Suffrage, or the Reasons they ought to want it, Have No Bearing On Our Question."

Gentlemen of the United States Congress, do you believe that "facts as to the Results Of Equal Suffrage," or the "Number Of Women Who Want Suffrage" or the Reasons They Should Or Should Not Want It "Have No Bearing On Our Question?"

Do you believe that the most revolutionary experiment in representative government should be tried throughout the United States at a time of international crisis in military, naval, fiscal, tariff and social problems?

Do you believe a policy not yet proved a success in the most favorable environment in our sparsely settled western States, where the full number of women enfranchised in eleven States is 15,000 fewer than the women over twenty-one in the Single State Of Pennsylvania, should be heedlessly undertaken on a National Scale in spite of the Protest At The Polls of such States as Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Missouri, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and Without Examination Of The Results Of Woman Suffrage, and Without The Consent Of The Majority Of Women?

Government consists largely in limiting the liberties of the few to safeguard the interests of the many—this is fundamental democracy, the rule of the majority. No one can have a "right" in a community not conferred by its members, and enacted legislation can only be enforced when it is backed by Public Opinion Formed By The Majority.

But you will be told: "Women will not have to vote." The National Suffrage Association recently issued a circular closing with these words: "It may be urged, of course, that many women do not want the ballot. What of that? Thousands of men never vote, and the women will have the Same Right As A Man To Shirk The Duties of Citizenship."

Gentlemen, do you believe our citizenship can be improved by shirking its duties; by increasing the "stay at home" vote; by allowing and advising women to have merely a casual interest in the exercise of a paramount duty?

Is not the granting of the franchise to persons whose only

object in its exercise would be to benefit themselves rather than the State a privilege which would automatically Double The Socialist Vote, and the Revolutionary Vote and the Ignorant Vote, while preaching the Right To Shirk to the majority—the most dangerous proposition ever advocated in regard to the extension of the electorate?

\* \* \* \* \*

Further Dr. Shaw contends:

"If men would divest themselves for one moment of the thought that women are related to them and other men \* \* \* I doubt very much whether any man fundamentally sound and logical \* \* \* could ever again utter a democratic principle without recognizing its application to the womanhood of the nation."

This is faultless logic—with which every Anti-Suffragist will agree—"if men would only divest themselves of the thought that women are related to them" \* \* \* Of Course They Would Be Suffragists.

That is the *whole trouble* with woman suffrage—that after nearly seventy years of ceaseless agitation it has convinced neither the majority of men nor women that they Are Not Relatives! When the Feminists convince you, that your wives, daughters, mothers and sisters are not relatives, but mere "human beings," belonging to a "slave sex," you have somehow "subjugated" by loving, defending and protecting in every way you can imagine—you must logically embrace their theory.

Until then, the women who are related to yourselves, and to the men by whom you were elected—the women who are Proud of their Womanhood and their Relationship to men—the women who Do Not Seek Suffrage and some sort of sex neutrality as mere "human beings," unrelated to everything but their own individuality—ask you to Vote Against The Bristow-Mondell and Shafroth-Palmer amendments to enfranchise women.

As Suffragists do not represent the will of women now, and beg you to ignore the will of women altogether in deciding this vital issue; as Suffragists as a class represent the desire of some women to identify themselves as much as possible with man's methods, and to use man's tools, Neither Would They Fitly Represent The Will Of Women In Politics.

And to enfranchise women would merely start a corrupting force for all heedless women and create a burden on good women. We would all be forced to neglect the woman's work we want to continue, which is so vital to the Nation and the race, and take up man's weapons—chosen by Suffragists and placed in our hands against our wills—to Keep Them From Misrepresenting Us Further In Politics. This is what we mean, gentlemen, by the "burden of the ballot"—which is no mere play on words, but a menace to millions of earnest, thoughtful women, who believe they can serve the State better in their natural sphere than by imitating men.

## The Woman's Protest

### AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage  
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York  
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.  
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart. Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. VI.

January, 1915

No. 3

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

#### SUMMARY 1914

THE National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, during the year ending December 8, 1914, has organized State Associations in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Georgia, Nebraska and Committees in South Dakota and Delaware. In response to requests from the different States, Mrs. Dodge and Miss Bronson went in January to Charleston, S. C., and to Richmond, Va., where they had large and successful meetings. In February, Mrs. Dodge and Miss Bronson made a trip through the West, which included enthusiastic meetings in Milwaukee, Madison, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Omaha and Cincinnati. In March, Miss Bronson and Miss Markeson went to Nevada and Montana where State Committees were waiting to be formed into State Associations. During the summer and early fall this Association assisted the State Associations in the campaign States of Montana, Nevada, Nebraska, Ohio, North Dakota and the Committees in South Dakota and Missouri, by sending speakers, organizers and campaign literature, and was largely responsible for the defeat of woman suffrage in five States.

The work of the Anti-Suffrage speakers on the Chautauqua Circuits in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Virginia and New York gained many members for the State Associations and encouraged people to register their opposition to woman suffrage.

During the year, 183,000 pamphlets were sent to the State Associations as well as 53,000 leaflets in answer to requests for literature; 375 books were circulated, 200 banners used at State fairs, and in the campaign States 26,000 celluloid buttons and 5000 silk buttons.

The receipts during the year were \$17,425.81 and the expenditures, which included all the Western work, were \$17,292.92, leaving a balance on hand of \$132.89.

The work in Washington for the year began with the hearing before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives on December 4, 1913. During the morning and afternoon nineteen speakers argued against the resolution establishing a

committee on woman suffrage, and made a deep impression on the Committee as well as on the large audience.

On March 4, 1914, there was a hearing before the House Judiciary Committee which came as a result of the efforts of three factions of Suffragists who are using the reports of hearings for advertising purposes. The afternoon of March fourth was given to the speakers in opposition to suffrage who were introduced by Mrs. Dodge.

The third hearing on the question of woman suffrage was given to both sides by the House Committee on the Election of President, Vice-President and Representatives in Congress on March 24, 1914. Representative Sherley, of Kentucky, gave a strong constitutional argument showing many instances when it had been declared unconstitutional for the Federal Government to impose or force qualifications for the suffrage upon the States. Miss Bronson and Miss Price spoke at this hearing. This same Committee has just granted a second hearing to the Suffragists, and Congressman Sherley again spoke effectively in opposition to Federal interference in determining the electorate of the States.

The publicity work in Washington has been widely effective every week, even during the summer months, and reached from 400 to 1700 papers, according to the news value of the articles.

The machinery of the State Associations has been used most effectively for collections of moneys, garments and food for the Red Cross work in Europe and for the Belgian Relief, and is still so used.

#### RED CROSS

THE various State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage interested in war relief work have collected and shipped to the sufferers in Europe 50,000 garments and \$6,000 in money. The larger amount was collected mostly in small coin.

#### WOMAN'S WORK

(Chicago-Herald, Dec. 8, 1914.)

THE Chicago Woman's Club employment bureau has found one great industry where the jobs are more than the eligible seekers. Wages in it are admitted to be "normal" and even "high level." It isn't a "new trade," wherein time and opportunity have lacked for training workers. It is the oldest of "woman's work"—the industry of housekeeping.

It may be said that this is only "the everlasting domestic service question" over again. In a way it is, but it presents a new face. Heretofore the complaint has not been of a shortage of women knowing how to keep house. It has been that not enough women cared to do housework—found other work more attractive. Now it is, at least in Chicago, that not enough know how.

Yet it is certain that all these women seeking work were reared where housekeeping went on. In childhood and girlhood they were in daily contact with this industrial process. Yet it seems evident that many of them were permitted to grow up knowing little or nothing about it.

We seem to be reaping the fruits of a condition against which social moralists were preaching vigorously about a generation back—the willingness or weakness of so many mothers in omitting to teach their daughters their own housewifely arts.

The voices of these preachers and prophets grew feebler with the years. They were drowned out, as it were, by the rising chorus of acclaim over the "new vocations"—the "wider opportunities" for women.

Yet if these almost forgotten social prophets could return they would feel that they had been vindicated—that the educational error against which they vainly struggled had been proved such by its fruits.

## "WITHOUT A POPULAR MAJORITY IN A SINGLE STATE SUFFRAGE IS NOT A NATIONAL ISSUE"

By MRS. GEORGE P. WHITE

Chairman Organizing Committee Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

*This article was written for the Public Ledger of Philadelphia and appeared under the heading "Suffrage Is Going Instead of Coming—'Votes for Women' Not a National Issue except in Imaginations of a Few Enthusiastic Advocates of the Cause."*

A SUFFRAGE writer who has been defending "votes for women" more years than we can remember now confesses that it is "wholly impossible to keep up with" anti-suffrage arguments. She could, she says, refute every paragraph, "but to what good end? Woman suffrage is now a national issue \* \* \* it is as inevitable throughout the United States as to-morrow's sunrise." "It is making gradual but sure progress," she believes.

Is woman suffrage a national issue? Not if we are to believe what President Wilson has told eight delegations of Suffragists; not if we are to believe the expressed sentiments of the overwhelming majority of both branches of Congress, and not if we are to believe the best-informed Suffragists themselves. On the floor of the Nashville National Suffrage Convention recently Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch told the Congressional Committee that the members of the House and Senate were "laughing in their sleeves" when they urged them to submit the Shafroth-Palmer amendment, and the Congressional Committee, in turn, termed the Bristow-Mondell amendment the "millennium" that could not be obtained in thirty years. Also, there are numerous men high up in public life who believe in woman suffrage who are absolutely against making "votes for women" a national question.

Mr. Bryan himself, who made sixteen speeches for suffrage during the campaign in Nebraska—where it was defeated—has recently taken the Suffragists to task in the *Commoner* for misrepresenting him as in favor of any national amendment, and Speaker Clark, also a Suffragist, refused point blank to approve national legislation on suffrage. Neither of the great political parties, and none of the leaders, whether Suffragists or Antis, will admit that suffrage is a national question—and every man and woman who reads the newspapers knows it is not a national question except in the imaginations of a few hopeful enthusiasts who are probably blinded by their love of the "cause." Every "suffrage stunt" known to an expert press bureau is periodically performed to make believe that suffrage is a national question; but it has been the same kind of a national question at every session of Congress since 1869, and at its present rate of "progress," assuming that it gets no setbacks whatever, a statistician has recently figured that it would take 326 years to become adopted by the whole people of the United States. In sixty-five years, though suffrage has succeeded in "slipping through" eleven States on waves of Populism, insurgency, Mormonism and Socialism, as admitted by its advocates, it has never been won by a popular majority or where the public had really studied the question. And although we are always reminded that "every Socialist is a Suffragist," and there are more than 1,000,000 Socialists—men who vote the Socialist ticket—there are less than 200,000 members of the National Woman Suffrage Association, though it only costs 10 cents to become one.

If, however, we examine suffrage strength on the assumption that the States where women vote will coerce the rest of the United States—which is only an assumption—we discover that the Mormon Church is alleged to have exactly the same number of representatives in Congress as the suffrage States—and therefore, at the same time that suffrage is forced upon us by national legislation, the Mormon religion will become our State Church!

It is rather remarkable that Mormonism flourishes best in

suffrage States, or *vice versa*, whichever you prefer; and, though numerous representative women have gone on record against Mormonism, the Suffragists, of course, cannot condemn it, because, like Socialism, it is one of their aids.

The second vote on suffrage in the case of both Michigan and Ohio demonstrated a growing opposition to woman suffrage where the public has maximum information about the issue. In Ohio, in 1912, the most votes ever cast for a suffrage amendment were counted, yet the measure lost by 87,000; and in 1914, though the suffrage vote was a thousand less than two years previously, the majority against had increased to 182,000. And yet the Suffragists expected a "landslide" in Ohio this year that was "to unlock the door of the East" to "votes for women."

As Mrs. A. J. George recently pointed out, the "landslide has already severely set in—against suffrage."

Thus we see that suffrage is not a national issue, and rather going instead of coming as a State question. Now, why is this true? Why, after sixty-five years of argument and agitation, do so few women want to vote? Does it not show something fundamentally false in a political principle meeting with such long continued and increasing opposition?

We must remember that woman suffrage agitation brought the first instance in history where the proposed electorate protested against its own enfranchisement. It is always said by Suffragists that no argument has ever been advanced against woman suffrage that was not advanced also against the extension of manhood suffrage. And this usually passes unquestioned, though we do not believe the staunchest advocate of suffrage would contend that any one ever argued against manhood suffrage on account of their sex! And this, of course, is the primal argument against woman suffrage.

At a recent notable debate on "Woman Suffrage and the Larger Feminism," where Mrs. Charlotte Perkins-Gilman and G. E. O'Dell defended suffrage, and Mrs. A. J. George and John A. Matthews showed why women will not and should not vote, several significant admissions were made in favor of the anti-suffrage arguments. The majority of women who do not want the vote "ought to want it," we were told by Mr. O'Dell, and it was frankly admitted that voting was a "duty instead of a right."

The only excuse for making women assume this new duty was, not that it had ever done any good in suffrage States, but that it would change their "spiritual environment" and give them something to do, as they were "not doing one-tenth of the work in the world they should do." No single instance of one law or one reform enacted by the "votes of women" that was not also present where women do not vote was even alleged. Our United States Government was termed a "jail let loose" by the feminist from England, and the women who were told that as teachers and mothers they had done their work "exceedingly bad" were asked to bring the "mother spirit" into the jail and the school. As women teach the vast majority of our schools, the "mother spirit" does not need a vote for its expression. If it did the schools would be in a poor way, as where women have school suffrage it is increasingly difficult to get them to vote on school questions.

As for the good the vote does in putting the "mother spirit"

into jails, etc., we have without a vote Miss Katherine B. Davis, Commissioner of Correction in New York, and laws in nearly all of our male suffrage States requiring women as matrons, etc., for feminine prisoners. Whereas in Colorado, where the "mother spirit" has had twenty-three years of political practice, we have had two very glaring instances of "anarchy let loose," and down in Arizona, where women have voted several years, there was not enough "mother spirit" at the polls at the last election to save fifteen men from hanging!

Suffrage would be worthy of our serious consideration as to what it will do now, if forty-five, twenty-one, eighteen years and less had not proved what it has done in suffrage States. Anything is almost "worth trying once" and the main argument against woman suffrage is the old Biblical argument on which Belshazzar was condemned—it has been "tried and found wanting."

It is significant of suffrage failure that its staunchest present

advocates are still talking of "when women get the vote," and confining themselves to dreams about "spiritual environment" and "the mother spirit" instead of giving us some tangible reason why women should assume a new duty merely to duplicate figures, increase taxation, and plunge into party politics.

Have the women of Wyoming, for instance, who have voted forty-five years—and where the percentage of married men is lowest in the Union, though it may have nothing to do with suffrage—ever done anything wonderful in developing themselves? By the way, why are there fewer women in Wyoming than in Harrisburg, if all these years it has offered "freedom" to those women whom Suffragists call "slaves" where they do not vote? Besides, how comes it that the Suffragists nearly all come from non-suffrage States, that neither leaders nor workers nor speakers can be gotten, except in very rare instances, to come out of these "free" States and tell us how we can benefit ourselves and the community by voting?

## THE ATTITUDE OF THE PRESIDENT—AND THE SUFFRAGISTS'

*Just at this time the attitude of the Suffragists toward the President of the United States is a matter that interests all citizens, men and women. Of particular interest, therefore, is this quotation from a statement by Mrs. Horace Brock, President of the Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.*

THOSE who have become interested in the "votes for women" question as a serious social problem now demanding our scrutiny as well as our study, will be amused at the patronizing of President Wilson, now, by the suffrage seekers. Though the President has always been conceded to be a scholar, and "votes for women" has been an issue since 1848, we are asked to believe that "it is doubtful if he had ever heard the subject thoroughly discussed" before entering the White House two years ago! Then, the Suffragists tell us, "he was positively opposed to the enfranchisement of women"—and eight delegations of Suffragists, subjecting him to cross-examinations, refusing to shake hands with him and "turning up their noses" on several occasions, while "demanding action at this session of Congress" and spending large sums of money to "defeat the Democrats," have effected "a very great advance in the Presi-

dent's views since he entered the White House less than two years ago."

"I am deeply impressed with the movement for woman suffrage," the President recently wrote a Government employee, "but I have thought that it can be best worked and most solidly and conclusively developed from State to State under the Constitution as it now stands, rather than by sweeping changes in the fundamental law of the nation."

Of course, this statement of the President's views is diametrically opposed to both of the suffrage amendments he has been asked to support, and his impression of the woman suffrage movement, formed after constant annoyance and heckling by its representatives, may mean an "advance" in his views expressed when he was "positively opposed to woman suffrage." It certainly does not indicate a "flop" to "votes for women" to anyone but a hopeful Suffragist without a sense of humor.

But this goes to illustrate the kind of straws the sinking suffrage agitation will attempt to clutch. President Wilson believes that the woman suffrage question can be solved "most solidly and conclusively" by the States under our present Constitution. Strangely, this is exactly what Anti-Suffragists believe! And just what Suffragists do not want!

## "AREA" MEANS NOTHING; "POPULATION DENSITY" MEANS MUCH

THIS year of 1915 is the decisive year for or against woman suffrage. In September the people of New Jersey and in November the people of Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania, four of the most populous States in the Union, will decide whether or not the scheme which has floated into effect in small Western States on waves of Populism, Mormonism, Socialism and so-called Progressivism shall be added to the already over-complex machinery of government.

The greatest barrier to the success of woman suffrage in any of these States is partly the sober sanity which anarchists, Socialists and Suffragists term "conservatism" and partly the radically different conditions prevailing in the sparsely settled Western States and the thickly settled Eastern States.

Under the existing conditions, conservatism is common sense.

Under these conditions every suffrage argument should be tested with the acid question: Is it common sense?

Let us examine their latest argument.

The Suffragists are spreading broadcast a map with the woman suffrage States in white and the non-suffrage States in black, bearing the caption: "Half the area of the United States votes; why not the other half?"

The question is asked rhetorically. The Suffragist never expects an answer. But—Is it common sense?

In the first place area does not vote. It is people who vote. We ask the reader's pardon for pointing this out. And at the same time we realize that it may be dangerous. Some Suffragist is sure to come back at us and say, "Well, women are people, aren't they? So why shouldn't they vote?" For answer we could only say, patiently, "Yes, women are people; citizens, too. If you are in earnest, you can learn why they shouldn't vote by referring to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST for the last three years and

the anti-suffrage literature listed on the back page of this number."

But to return to "area."

Suffragist argument runs like this:

"Women vote equally with men in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Nevada and Montana.

"Many laws for the protection of women and children have been passed in these States since women secured the vote.

"Therefore women should vote in all States."

Meanwhile they neglect to state that equally good, or better, laws for the protection of women and children have been passed in male suffrage States. They neglect to point out, as has been done in THE PROTEST (in December, 1912, January, 1913, and July, 1913), that such laws in the dark, forlorn, hopeless, black States of Massachusetts, New Jersey and Pennsylvania are equal or superior to the laws in Colorado, the paragon of suffrage States.

This, however, is getting away from "area."

But the most important point of all, overlooked by the Suffragists, is this: The problem of States where only fifteen people live on each square mile is totally different and infinitely more simple than the problem of States where 279 people live on each square mile.

Area means nothing; density of population means much.

The problem of Boston, of Newark, of New York, of Philadelphia is infinitely more complex than the problem of Walla Walla, of Sheridan, of Denver, of Reno.

The possibilities and opportunity for manipulating the voters are infinitely greater in mass than in units.

The veriest tyro knows this.

No one disputes it.

But Suffragists overlook it and say thoughtlessly, like children repeating a lesson, "One half the area votes; why not the other half?"

Suffragists do not analyze, they generalize.

What of the 1,068,383 foreign-born women of voting age in the State of New York alone? What do they know of American ideals and institutions? Yet they would automatically become voters if their husbands have been naturalized, should the Suffragist agitators succeed in imposing their whim upon the women of New York in the November election.

What of the second generation—those women over twenty-one who are of foreign or mixed parentage, 710,145 of them in New York alone. These may be more familiar with American government, but many are schooled in Socialism.

Offsetting these 1,778,528 people of foreign stock and old-world ideas are but 927,995 women of native parentage over twenty-one years of age.

Right here a Suffragist asks: "But don't you believe in democracy?"

We do not believe in the kind of suffrage democracy that permits the ignorant foreigner to be voted by a political machine for the advantage of evil interests.

Such will be the inevitable result of pouring a vast mass of new and ignorant voters into the political machinery of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

In the last election in Chicago (see article in the November PROTEST) the women voted as partisans, practically as the men of their families voted. The ignorant and the vicious "woman vote" can be swung exactly as the same sort of "male vote" is manipulated.

This ignorant and vicious vote is already the greatest handicap to good government, and this vote will be immensely increased by woman suffrage in the densely populated States.

Next to this vote, the greatest handicap to good government is the moral but stay-at-home vote. This group would be immensely increased by forcing upon women, already fully occupied, the additional burden of the ballot—a duty most of them earnestly desire to be protected from.

Let us examine the comparative density East and West.

The four States of Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania contain a population of 22,682,308. Their density, or population per square mile, is 279.7.

The eleven full-suffrage States of the West contain a population of only 8,189,469. Their density is only 7.5.

Including Illinois (where partial woman-suffrage obtains), with its 5,638,591 people, the total woman-suffrage population is only 13,828,060, while its population per square mile is 15.3.

It is density that determines the degree to which the vote can be manipulated. As density increases, corrupt practices increase. This is an axiom that needs no proof, a self-evident truth.

Every citizen will find the following table an interesting study:

STATES VOTING ON SUFFRAGE IN 1915

STATE	POPULATION	DENSITY*
Massachusetts.....	3,366,416	418.8
New York.....	9,113,614	191.2
New Jersey.....	2,537,167	337.7
Pennsylvania.....	7,665,111	171
Total.....	22,682,308	1118.7
Average.....	5,670,577	279.7

STATES WHERE WOMAN SUFFRAGE PREVAILS

STATE	POPULATION	DENSITY*
Arizona.....	204,354	1.8
California.....	2,377,549	15.3
Colorado.....	799,024	7.7
Idaho.....	325,594	3.9
Illinois†.....	5,638,591	100.6
Kansas.....	1,690,949	20.7
Montana.....	376,053	2.6
Nevada.....	81,875	.7
Oregon.....	672,765	7
Utah.....	373,351	4.5
Washington.....	1,141,990	17.1
Wyoming.....	145,965	1.5
Total.....	13,828,060	183.4
Average.....	1,152,338	15.3

RECAPITULATION

STATES	POPULATION	DENSITY*
Four Eastern.....	Total 22,682,308	279.7
	Average 5,670,577	
Twelve Western.....	Total 13,828,060	15.3
	Average 1,152,338	

\*Population per square mile.

†Partial woman suffrage.

# WHY SUFFRAGISTS PREFER TO FACE LEGISLATURES RATHER THAN VOTERS-AT-THE-POLLS

BY MRS. JOHN B. HERON

Vice-President, National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

**T**HE National House of Representatives is about to vote on what one of its members calls the "most perplexing political issue of the day"—the question of "votes for women."

This will mark the first time in history that the "woman question" in this shape has been decided by the House, although the Bristow-Mondell amendment to the Federal Constitution, the measure the Representatives will vote on, has been introduced at every session of Congress since 1869. This is the old "Susan B. Anthony bill," which, if ratified by three-fourths of the State Legislatures, and passed by two-thirds vote of both branches of Congress, would prohibit any State's qualifying its electorate according to sex. The terms of the amendment are as follows: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex" and "Congress shall have power by appropriate legislation to enforce the provisions of this article."

This bill has been defeated twice in the Senate, and its most hopeful advocates refuse to prophesy its victory in the House. Indeed, it is conceded by leaders that the vote on woman suffrage, coming so soon after the overwhelming defeat of "votes for women" in Ohio, Missouri, Nebraska, North and South Dakota at the last election, and introduced by the party which has been the subject of suffrage attack throughout the last campaign, is a deliberate design to defeat this measure so signally that it will not remain an issue in the next Presidential campaign. The Suffragists recently acknowledged having spent over \$8,000 in the futile attempt to carry out their campaign threats to "defeat the Democrats" at the last election.

Besides the "declaration of war against the Democrats" issued by the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, the so-called "militant faction," the Congressional Committee of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, with the concurrence and approval of the General Board of that body, as admitted by Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, its President, at the recent national convention, marked various candidates for defeat on its "blacklist"—which was also a boomerang to the "cause." Neither the "war on the Democrats" nor the suffrage "blacklist" had the designed effect at the November elections and both were the subject of much remorse at the Nashville convention, where they were explained as mere "publicity stunts" and not "really truly meant," you know. That is, the Suffragists had figured that it would be good advertising for the "cause" to compete with the war in Europe by carrying on a mimic political war against the "party in power." But besides this, the National Association, to show its boasted "non-partisanship," included both Republicans and Democrats, Suffragists and Antis, on its "blacklist."

## BLACKLIST HURT "CAUSE"

The "blacklisted" members of the Senate and House were accused of being "against humanitarian legislation," which, of course, is about the hardest thing a body of women can say about male legislators. These men, however, succeeded in proving their innocence to the public, and were returned victorious at the polls—with the result that the Suffragists spent almost two days at their national convention (after the election) in criticizing each other for ever having gotten it up. Then, naturally, the unfortunate proceeding was blamed on the "newspapers"—you can always blame the newspapers, you know—in having called it

a "blacklist" instead of a humanitarian certificate, or whatever else the Suffragists would rather have it called *now*. It was not explained, however, how an original official copy of the "suffrage bulletin" sent to the newspapers contained the word "blacklist" in no uncertain terms! It is just possible that since the Suffragists tried so hard to "defeat the Democrats" and to "blacklist" men like Senator Lodge and Representative Mann, and thereby revealed their puerile political power, these men are now returning the compliment by defeating the Suffragists. Of course, Representative Mann of Illinois, who was blacklisted, has since become an advocate of the cause. In fact, this was the only excuse offered by the originators of the "blacklist" when asked to explain, at the convention, "what good it had done suffrage." "Well, it smoked out the leader of the opposition, Representative Mann, anyhow," replied the Chairman of the Congressional Committee. This was vigorously denied by the Suffragists of Illinois, who claimed his conversion prior to the issue of the "blacklist"—so there you are.

The day after the "blacklist" was released, Chairman Henry of the House Rules Committee, refused point blank to give suffrage another hearing or permit a vote on it in the House. Now, however, everything is changed, and the most vigorous opponents to "votes for women" blandly welcome a chance to vote on it. Need we wonder why?

## NOT A NATIONAL ISSUE

The Suffragists have called their question a "national issue" in spite of the fact that the leaders of the big parties, whether Suffragists or Antis, Republicans or Democrats, have repeatedly told them it was a "State's rights" question. But after sixty-five years of agitation, and the recent proof at the polls in five great States that woman suffrage is one of the most unpopular measures before the public, persistence in asking for national interference, the continuous heckling of Congressmen and frequent delegations to the President have made politicians so sick of suffrage that they have arranged to vote on it and get rid of it.

However, it is not likely that the vote in the House will represent fairly either the opinions of the members or of the constituencies they represent.

Some men will vote on the question as a moral issue and cast their ballots against it because it is undemocratic and contrary to the principles of local self-government. Perhaps the majority of the opposition vote will be based on such grounds. But the vote in favor of the bill will represent, in some cases, no more than party opposition to the majority. Many Republicans, sure the bill will be defeated, will cast their votes for it just because they know the majority of Democrats will vote against it. Then, too, representatives from suffrage States will largely vote for the measure because thereby they escape the inevitable "suffrage letter" that is now the nuisance of Congress.

## WOMEN GREATEST LOBBYISTS

A Member of Congress in a recent special article briefly describes the various lobbies kept up by "interests" of different kinds. He goes into the "standardization" of "letters from home" and wonders if this is becoming a "Government by correspondence!" And then he informs us that "the Woman Suffragists and the Anti-Woman Suffragists" have the most per-

sistent lobbies. It is rather hard on the suffrage argument that women need votes to note that without votes they are already far ahead of mere men in "controlling legislatures." In fact, the Suffragists have become rather adept at the "standardization" of lobbying, having carried it on for nearly seventy years, whereas the Antis are only amateurs at this, as yet. "These letters and telegrams from home are a wonderful help to us," said the leader of the Congressional Committee of the National Suffrage Association, to their convention, "for even though these men know that they are originated by the Committee, and know that we have caused them to be sent, they are influenced nevertheless."

And this is why the women in suffrage circles would rather meet the "Antis" in the legislatures than at the polls. They are defeated in nearly every case at the polls, because there the opposition is counted, whereas in a campaign of "letters from home" the side that has the most "standardization" and gets out the most frequent "orders" to representatives is apt to be mistaken for the majority. In fact, the noisy suffrage minority has afflicted Congress and the legislatures so much in the last half century that the majority of the men would rather vote on anything under the sun than woman suffrage. It is the one thing that politicians very often fail to measure—simply because the women possess the advantage of not having to show their numbers at the polls. If a man from any "interest" writes his Congressman, the Member can gauge pretty accurately just how many votes are back of that man, but when a woman writes, in the name of women, the Congressman is likely to consider it a demand on the part of all the women in his district unless he

has given the matter serious study. And there is nothing a man fears so much as the adverse sentiment of the women in his district. Impossible to count or estimate, as a rule, it may represent the views of the majority of women—who, of course, will have their wishes carried out by their husbands, fathers, sons and brothers at the polls. Mere man can only represent himself as a Democrat or Republican or Socialist, etc., and threaten or cajole only as his party has political power—but woman writes or speaks as a non-partisan, a moral power behind ballots not measurable by party strength. This is why Congressmen call this the "most perplexing political issue"—the Suffragists, though not in their most roseate claims establishing so much as 10 per cent. of the women in favor of votes, have so standardized "indirect influence" that many men mistake the noise of the few as representing the will of the majority. All other considerations aside, it is acknowledged by both Suffragists and Antis that "women will get the vote if they want it."

The overwhelming majority, as proved at the polls, do not want it, and even the Suffragists, in their latest plea to put "votes for women" up to the State legislatures instead of to the people—because the campaigns are so "hard on the women workers" tacitly acknowledge that they would rather trust to "indirect influence" than the vote. Hard and trying political campaigns would be just exactly what women would have to go into every election if they voted, and therefore we are heartily in favor of the suffrage view that women should not be required to enter them. Antis, too, believe women should and can get the things they want better from their legislatures than by going out into the political arena—that's why they are Antis!

## FACTIONAL SUFFRAGE FIGHT EARNS COURT REBUKE

**P**OLITICS is war. The spirit of fight permeates all phases of politics. There are "internal politics," which leaders of parties dread, and "office politics," which business men fear. The basis of all factional politics is the preferment of one individual, or group, over another, and the good of the organization is sacrificed in the petty struggle.

This is the weakness of all partisan effort. Two political parties each seek the good of the people. Each disagrees with the other on how this good shall be accomplished—and instead of fighting the evil forces that prevent reform, they fight each other. The same condition prevails within parties.

No organization is free from such strife. There are always minorities who disagree. That organization is most free whose reason for existence is farthest removed from the advancement of any individual or group.

What of the Suffragists?

It is not true that all Suffragists seek personal advancement of one kind or another. Many are sincere.

But what of the leaders?

It is true that factional quarreling among the Suffrage leaders has occupied a prominent place in the newspapers for many months. There are five separate and distinct suffrage organizations in New York State alone.

An especially significant event occurred among the New Haven, Conn., Suffragists recently.

The New Haven Political Equality Club was organized some two years ago by twenty or thirty women of New Haven. About a year ago quite a number of the members decided that the salvation of the club depended on each one of them becoming president. As there could be but one president several were naturally disappointed. A meeting was held one night which narrowly escaped being a free-for-all fight, and finally broke up when one

of the "ladies" present put out the lights. Religious beliefs were also brought into the issue and this added zest to the riot.

It is seldom that a justice of the higher courts takes pains to be quite as scathing as Judge Case of the Superior Court of Connecticut before whom the suffrage quarrel was taken.

In dismissing the complaints, Judge Case said:

"The New Haven Political Equality Club is an organization composed chiefly of women. Its title is properly suggestive of a broad, equitable purpose. There is a small male membership, apparently negligible, save for the unworthy function of stirring the women to great wrath over points of parliamentary procedure. The origin of the present disturbance, though somewhat obscure, seems traceable to this questionable interference, and two factions are in hopeless dispute over their respective rights to the exclusive use of the club's name.

"One faction has expelled the other by a resolution of withering contempt, and the expelled group have retaliated by suspending the supporters of the resolution. In spite of the veneration in which Cushing is held by the club, none of these proceedings have the slightest semblance of regularity, and need be considered only in a Pickwickian sense. Each side now appeals to equity to maintain its sole right to the name as its only salvation from irreparable injury.

"It does not appear that any part of the public outside the limited membership of the organization is at all interested in, or agitated over, the outcome of this foolish litigation. It does not appear that any injury worth a court's consideration had occurred to either faction. It does appear, however, that neither party had observed the plainest principles of equity in dealing with the others, and in accordance with a familiar maxim, perhaps not sufficiently emphasized by Cushing, both the complaint and the cross-complaint are dismissed."

## MRS. HUMPHRY WARD'S LEGISLATIVE TRIUMPH

**A**N article in the *Minneapolis Journal*, November 23, 1914, marked "London Correspondence, November 6th," is headed, "Mrs. Humphry Ward Leads Undertaking Giving Women More Power in Legislation—Authoress Scores Over Woman Suffrage Advocates in England," and reads as follows:

"By one of the ironies of politics, Mrs. Humphry Ward, who is generally looked upon here as the head and front of the Anti-Suffragists, has been largely influential in an undertaking that has given women more power in English legislation than has been won by all the agitation in other directions. The thing has been done so quietly that practically nothing has been written about it, although it seems to have a significance far beyond the actual results it has already accomplished.

"The most important of those results up to date is the fact that, during the last session of Parliament important changes and alterations in several government bills affecting the welfare of women were secured. This was due to the efforts of a powerful body, principally composed of prominent women workers, but also numbering no less than twenty-five members of Parliament, which was called into being by Mrs. Ward, at whose London house its first meetings were held. The body calls itself the joint advisory committee, and its avowed object is to bring pressure—the pressure of the considered judgment of the best feminine brains in the country—on Parliament in all such matters as affect the women, and particularly the children of Great Britain.

"Quite a lot of the fifty-odd women of note who are members of this committee are the possessors of titles, but each and every one of them is also distinguished by reason of her practical acquaintance and work in connection with the leading economic questions of the day, while the others are well-known authorities on social work, the majority of whom either hold government posts or are members of local or public bodies, such as royal commissions, county or town councils, departmental committees,

boards of guardians, school management committees, etc.

"So far as possible, the members of this joint advisory committee represent, in equal proportion, both the ministerial and union parties, and at the outset it was agreed that the question of female suffrage should be excluded from the debates and action of the committee. Sitting in one of the Westminster Hall committee rooms of the House of Commons itself, this influential body held monthly meetings from April to July of the present year, or until the Parliamentary vacation, with results which appeared to promise great things for the future.

"It received reports from subcommittees of women on the bills actually before Parliament and made arrangements to deal immediately in the House with the recommendation adopted and so successfully, as has been said, that important changes in many of them were secured. Such questions as the special treatment of female prisoners, the establishment of play centers and of special schools for physically and mentally defective children and the eligibility of women for service on various administrative bodies were dealt with, and the experiment proved so interesting to all concerned that it will be revived in quieter times."

*(The joint advisory committee referred to in the foregoing is an authorized body created by an act of Parliament in March, 1914.—Editor.)*

Requests have come to us for verification of a statement in the *PROTEST* that there were women in England holding the office of mayor. The following have served in that office; Mrs. Garrett Anderson, Mayor of Aldborough in 1908 and 1909; Miss Morgan, Mayor of Brecon in 1910; Mrs. Lees, Mayor of Oldham in 1912.

These mayors are members of town councils, elected for one year, and may be re-elected. None were elected or re-elected in 1913 or 1914.

## WOMAN'S SCHOOL VOTE NOW 71% LESS THAN IN 1903

**T**HE Suffragists say women desire to vote to protect the interests of their own and other people's children (or would the Feminists have us say "other women's" children?).

The education of the child is universally admitted to be of importance. This is admitted even by Suffragists who contend for "dropping a piece of paper into a slot" as being more efficacious than education.

And yet—

"The vanishing woman school committee voter, not only in Boston, but in the State as a whole, has become an alarming fact, according to the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association."

This statement from a Boston newspaper goes on to say:

"The recent Boston city election, which showed that of some 200,000 women of voting age, only 9413 bothered to even register, while only 3949 voted, has brought the issue sharply home. A certain percentage of the women of voting age were not eligible for registration purposes, but after all deductions are made the total of the indifferent women is very large.

"The list of registered women voters at the present time in Boston is the smallest since 1898. The number of women voting in Boston at the elections held last January and the other day is the smallest for an even larger number of years.

"In the last thirty odd years the women voters only once dropped below 5000 in their participation at the polls, and that was in 1908, when they cast only 4363 votes. In the last two elections they have ranked below 4000.

"Cold weather and other annoying conditions have at times been given as the primary cause of the failure of women to turn out and vote, but that hardly explains the failure of women to register and thus qualify themselves for the exercise of the franchise.

"The size of this steady drop in the number of women who care to exert themselves to register and vote is shown by the following table, covering the period from 1903 to date:

Year.	No. registered.	No. voting.
1903.....	18,515	13,655
1904.....	17,119	8,919
1905.....	15,655	9,319
1906.....	14,628	7,595
1907.....	13,693	7,675
1908.....	12,554	4,363
*1910.....	11,912	6,483
1911.....	11,269	5,530
1912.....	12,255	6,350
1913.....	11,127	4,939
†1914.....	10,020	3,086
‡1914.....	9,413	3,949

\*Change of year. †Mayorality election. ‡December."

The only conclusion an unbiased, unemotional observer can make is that the Election Commissioners err in their figures—or Suffragists err when they say that women are interested in the vote as a means of improving conditions. The Election Commissioners do not err.

### How War Reveals Flaws in Feminist Logic

**S**UFFRAGISTS, Feminists, Economic Independentists all tell us that women deserve the "privilege" of sharing the work of the world with men.

The following editorial is interesting in this connection.

"At one time the Feminist is in revolt because women are debarred from any of the occupations of men. Equal opportunity is the cry. But the latest grievance of a leading advocate of sex emancipation is that war conditions in Europe are causing women to take up numerous occupations usually performed by men. The awful drudgery thus incurred, she argues, will make the next generation inferior mentally and physical weak and as a result women will be put back into the conditions of primitive tribal days. The logical process is not very clear. It might be supposed that a state of things which killed off the men and added to the importance of women's efforts should not be unfavorable to the latter. Perhaps the truth that galls is that the realities of war have caused a rectification of the normal woman's own ideas as to her sphere of influence and usefulness."—*New York Sun*, December 29, 1914.

Doubtless it was this statement of Mrs. Spencer which produced the above editorial:

PHILADELPHIA, Dec. 27.—"War destroys all that enlightened women have fought for and makes them again the slaves of men."

This arraignment of war was made by Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, professor of sociology in Meadville Theological Seminary, White Plains, N. Y., in a lecture on "War and Women" to-day at the Broad Street Theater.

"War makes women the slave prize of the victor," declared Mrs. Spencer. "In primitive war women of the defeated tribe became the slaves of the conqueror. This set the fashion for women's slavery in our marriage contract. The war in Europe is to-day sending the women into the fields and the streets to do the work the men are neglecting that they may kill each other. She is the only worker left.

"The awful, hopeless drudgery of the women in Europe will make the next generation born on European battlefields inferior mentally and physically weak. This will happen because women have been put back into the drudgery of primitive tribal days, from which the enlightened women of to-day have emerged after centuries of struggle."

### The Home Responsibilities of American Girls

**I**N an article in the December *Ladies' Home Journal* Miss Anne Morgan discusses the responsibilities of the American girl.

She takes very emphatic exception to the statements of Suffragist-Feminists that woman's work in connection with the home is to-day of secondary importance. She says:

"The eighteenth century brought to the world a deeper and better understanding of the rights of man; the nineteenth century has carried the message on; but it remains for the twentieth century to develop a new interpretation of the duties rather than the rights of woman. It is often said that the woman must go to the factory to find the work which has been taken from the home. The smoke-house and the spinning wheel have indeed grown into the fireless cooker and the mill of a thousand looms, but the girl's own relation toward her home does not need to change because the field of her operation changes. She must feel that the home is the unit of life, the object for which all science becomes worth while; that, far from a limit or a hindrance to her development, it is the center from which all effort springs and to which each new interest and higher ideals must be brought in turn. This result can be accomplished with real co-operation only when every member of a family does his or her share toward the material, physical and spiritual comfort of the common unit. Domestic science will then cease to be a drudgery, but become an art to beautify and adorn that which we love so well."

### "The Truly Useful Woman"

Mrs. A. J. George of Brookline in an interview given to the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, said, "The truly useful woman is a very unpretending sort of heroine. Her work is always obscure, often dull, but we are not going to have any country very long unless this sort of heroism is developed. We are distraught with appeals for votes for women when our need is for a leader who shall invoke woman to a better performance of her obligations, wherein the community has a right to expect her highest efficiency. This efficiency is lessened by all this distraction which is created by the appeal for the ballot in the hands of women as her best means of moralizing and reforming society."

### A Statement Suffragists Should Digest

**T**O the Public:

The statements and insinuations of the Suffragists and the W. C. T. U. that the work of our Association has been financed by liquor and vice interests and by money from outside the State are cruelly false in every particular. All money received and paid out has passed through my hands and I have had charge of the distribution of all literature and of all publicity work.

Not a penny has come from liquor or vice interests or from outside the State. It has all been contributed by our members and by men and women of our State who believe as we do, that woman suffrage is a menace to the home. The names of the officers of our Organization should be a guarantee of our honor and integrity and of the righteousness of our motives.

But that these defamatory charges may not continue to defame innocent woman, I accept the challenge of Mrs. Anderson and name Judge C. A. Pollock, S. S. Lyon and W. H. White, all of this city, as a committee to investigate and answer as to the truthfulness of my statements. I will account to them for every dollar received with names of contributors and amounts; for every dollar expended, to whom and for what paid, with proper vouchers, and will turn over all records of account, including bank books, checks, vouchers, receipts and contracts for printing, with a complete list of members; all records of our Organization and all correspondence, and will answer as to the truth of my statements under oath. Any person disbelieving my statements may inquire of this Committee and any two of the Committee may act.

(Signed) MRS. N. C. YOUNG,  
President North Dakota Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.  
Fargo, N. D., November 3, 1914.

### Suffrage Misstatements

The suffrage photo-play, "Your Girl and Mine," now going the rounds, conveys the impression that a married woman must pay her husband's debts, even those contracted before the nuptials, and that he can will away her children. When you see it or hear about it ask the Suffragists to explain in what State or States such laws exist. Then ask a lawyer about it, and see if you don't unfathom another suffrage myth.

## HOW THE CAMPAIGN STATES OF 1915 ARE EDUCATING THE VOTERS

### MASSACHUSETTS

THE Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women has, during the past year, distributed, in addition to thousands of fliers, 161,433 pamphlets and Remonstrances. It has obtained nearly 8000 new names. Its membership December 1, 1914, was 28,078 women of voting age in 396 cities, towns and villages. It has held 215 meetings, exclusive of Committee meetings, which have averaged two a week. Twenty-eight new branches have been formed during the year. In January a luncheon given by the Association at the Hotel Somerset was attended by nearly 1000 women from all parts of the State.

The membership of the Men's League has about doubled and the Junior League is growing rapidly.

Among the new pieces of work undertaken during the year may be mentioned the formation of the Public Interests League; the leasing of a store in the business part of the city where the sale of literature and buttons was continued for six months; exhibits at the Worcester and Framingham Fairs and a booth at the food fair in October. Our largest room on the ground floor of the Kensington Building has been placed at the disposal of the Public Interests League, and the first work undertaken there was for the relief of the sufferers from the Salem fire. Since September the room has been used as the working headquarters for the Massachusetts Branch of the Red Cross, and many thousand garments made and received there have been sent abroad.

In November a bureau of information was opened in connection with our office for the gathering and dissemination of statistics and general information.

### NEW JERSEY

WHAT has proven to be a very active year for the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was begun on December 4, 1913, when a large delegation, numbering nearly fifty members from the various branches in the State, attended the hearing before the Committee on Woman Suffrage of Congress. New Jersey supplied as speakers on this occasion Mrs. Grace Duffield Goodwin, Mrs. O. D. Oliphant and Miss Elsie Buck, a factory girl.

During the year 15 branch organizations have been formed, in addition to the 9 already in existence. Many more are now pending, and we have members in 166

places throughout the State. Our total membership to date is 11,000 and when compared with a total membership of 413 in March, 1913, proves conclusively that the opposition is growing steadily.

The Press Committee reports that columns have appeared regularly in several papers in the State.

Space in papers has been courteously accorded for announcement of meetings.

20,000 pieces of literature issued by the State Association have been sold to other organizations. Frequent requests come from schools for material for debates.

Miss Vezin, Legislative Chairman, conducted the hearing in Trenton, January 28, 1913, before the Joint Committee of the House and Senate. Speakers for suffrage were Mrs. Desha Breckinridge of Kentucky, Rabbi Wise of New York. There were seven anti-suffrage speakers, all from New Jersey, except Miss Bronson. The politicians voted according to their platform, irrespective of their personal views. Seven men out of eighty-one voted against suffrage. Miss Vezin, with five members of the Association, appeared before the Platform Committees of the Republican and Democratic parties. Both parties decided to let the question go to the people but without endorsement.

At the annual meeting in Trenton last May, receipts as reported were \$1,031.50, and since then \$598.18 have been received, making a total of \$1,629.68.

Public meetings filled the week of April 13th, when Miss Lucy Price and the Hon. John A. Matthews spoke before the various branches. Assistance was given to the Guidon Club by distributing literature at the meetings under its auspices in the Asbury Park Auditorium; these continued for a week in July and took the form of debates between prominent Suffragists and members of the club. On August 22d our Association held a meeting in this same auditorium, when the speakers were Mrs. O. D. Oliphant and the Hon. John A. Matthews. Miss Holmes, President of the Guidon Club, has since then kindly given her services as principal speaker at several meetings in this State.

Thousands of pieces of literature were distributed from decorated booths at the farmers' picnic held at Manasquan, the Monmouth County Fair at Red Bank, the Inter-State Fair at Trenton and the Poultry Show at Elizabeth. Speakers were sent to the picnics at Rancocas and Verona Lake. At the latter the Montclair and Orange branches furnished a tent, and the boy scouts in uniform distributed literature which reached thousands of visitors and many signatures were secured.

A protest against the action of the General Federation of Clubs, which endorsed woman suffrage, was sent to the 151 presidents of women's clubs in New Jersey. The New Jersey Federation at its meeting in November did not endorse woman suffrage.

The Men's League has been formed, with Col. William Libbey as its chairman. Through the generosity of Mr. R. C. Maxwell of Trenton, an electric sign, 8 by 40 feet in size, was proclaimed upon the boardwalk of Atlantic City, for six weeks, that "The Women of New Jersey Do Not Want to Vote!"

Two of our members carried to England letters from the Governor of New Jersey vouching that they were true Anti-Suffragists and could be safely admitted to art galleries and treasure houses.

We do not intend to abate our efforts, but rather to increase them in every direction, and we have faith that New Jersey will never give votes to women.

### NEW YORK

WE of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage believe that the backbone of woman suffrage was broken on November 3d of 1914. This was proved by the result in the West. In this State it is equally apparent that thoughtful men and women are aroused to the danger which would result from their indifference and our membership is increasing by leaps and bounds.

We have had constant calls for speakers from political clubs, settlements, church clubs and schools. Several debates have been held by various organizations, both in the city and through the State, and in the majority of instances where a vote has been taken the anti-suffrage side has been victorious.

During the summer we sent speakers to a number of Grange picnics and had booths at the county fairs.

The press work has developed encouragingly and we find the papers throughout the entire State are interested to have our news and it gets into their columns.

A luncheon was given at the Biltmore Hotel in April, at which 1000 men and women were seated. There were guests from Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Michigan.

The Wage Earners Anti-Suffrage League has made itself a factor in the work of the Association. Speakers from its ranks have assisted at several meetings—the most important of these being held at one of the Manhattan public schools.

The picnic on Memorial Day was arranged under their auspices, social gatherings have been held by them, and there is an increasing membership and interest for the work of this coming campaign year.

Forty thousand pieces of literature in pamphlet form were distributed, besides

many thousands of dodgers and ribbons, buttons and pennants have been sold. Mrs. Dodge, as Chairman of the Anti-Suffrage Committee of the State Federation of Women's Clubs, attended the Annual Convention at Binghamton. The endorsement of suffrage by the General Federation at Chicago was endorsed by the State Federation by a vote of 227 to 73—many delegates not voting. It was decided at the annual meeting in December that this Association should withdraw from the State Federation.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

THE work in Pennsylvania during the past year has been one of seed-sowing and development. The Legislature not being in session, no work at Harrisburg was necessary. In January, however, Miss Minnie Bronson and Miss Emmellinne Pitt spoke by invitation at a meeting of the Democratic Club in Philadelphia.

A meeting with the Republican Club at Landsdowne was arranged in March, at which Mr. McNeal spoke with good effect.

During the winter we furnished speakers for two debates at University Extension meetings.

We have sent speakers also to various clubs through the State who were taking up discussions on the suffrage question.

Three times during the year we have rented rooms in different sections of the city where we had large windows, and could make a good display of signs and literature. In February we went to the southern section for a month, in May to the northern section for two weeks, and the last week in April we rented a room with two large windows in the business section and attracted much attention, especially on the day of the suffrage parade. A number of men came in asking to sign our paper, saying they had wives or daughters or sisters in the parade and wanted to enter their protest. Two of our members arranged for a counting machine in a room at the Bingham House in order to check up the suffrage figures. There were 1715 persons in the parade, 1505 being women, 157 men and quite a number of children not over twelve years of age.

In March we had a booth at the big exhibition held at the Second Regiment Armory and secured over 800 names, mostly voters. Mrs. Oliphant spoke one evening and was greeted with great applause, the men calling out as she left, "bring her back, she talks sense, she speaks the truth."

On April 21st we had a large meeting at the Bellevue-Stratford in Philadelphia. Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, President, spoke for the National Organization. She was followed by Mr. Samuel, who spoke on the English situation; Miss Pitt, who spoke for the working women, and Mrs. A. J. George, who made the principal address of the eve-

ning. Mr. John R. Matthews closed the meeting.

On April 30th we made our first attempt to hold a State convention. This was held at Harrisburg. Mrs. Dodge presided at the meetings. All the States were asked to send representatives if possible, many did and others sent reports of their work.

Mr. John Fox Weiss, a leading lawyer in Harrisburg, made the address of welcome, which was responded to by Mrs. Dodge on behalf of the Pennsylvania Association and also National Association. Reports from different States were given, followed by reports of the work of study classes conducted by Mrs. Davis Kirk of Pittsburgh and Mrs. Frank J. Goodwin of New York.

At the evening meeting addresses were made by Miss Lucy Price of Ohio, Mrs. Frank J. Goodwin of New York and Mr. John A. Matthews closed with "A Man's Point of View Regarding Woman Suffrage."

Both sessions were well attended by men and women from the adjacent towns and much enthusiasm was shown.

Another good meeting at which Miss Price spoke was held at Lancaster Court House. Miss Price also spoke at the Normal School at Shippensburg. We have been doing extensive work among the Grangers. We had booths at the meetings of the State Grange at Williams Grove, securing 200 signatures from politicians. Several men came up and asked to be allowed to sign.

At the meeting of the National Grange in Wilmington, Delaware, we also had a successful booth and obtained many signatures. The work through the State has been most encouraging. We have had booths at all the county fairs in the eastern and middle section of the State, while the Pittsburgh Association has looked after the western end. Last year we found the people largely indifferent. Now we find them thoroughly aroused and eager to sign our petition and wear our buttons.

Miss Pitt, former Secretary of the Iron City Trades Council and Editor *National Metal Trades Review* of Pittsburgh, has done a large work among the labor organizations and has secured, she reports, about 40,000 signatures of men.

One of the most important works in the year was the meeting in Pittsburgh of the State Federation of Clubs. As the first President and still the Honorary President, Mrs. Brock asked to be allowed to speak a word of greeting and warning at the opening session of the Federation as it was in Pittsburgh, fifteen years ago, that she went out of office. She strongly emphasized the importance of neutrality on this question of suffrage, recalling how in the beginning of the work temperance and woman suffrage had been subjects carefully considered with the decision that they must be kept out if the Federation was to be really one of Pennsylvania women.

#### Suffragist War Cry, "Vote Early—and Often"

A CERTAIN Suffragist stated recently to a member of the Anti-Suffrage Association that she belongs to five separate suffrage associations in New York State alone! Another confesses, though not realizing that it is a confession, to having signed thirty-two suffrage cards, "yellow tickets."

When the names of those who favor suffrage are counted, how many times is each name counted? Incidentally, but pertinently, how many "enrolled Suffragists" are under twenty-one years of age?

The club women, Suffragists say, have indorsed suffrage. They neglect to say some club women, of course, and persons who remain in federations of clubs because they *did not indorse* woman suffrage, are represented in these titanic totals of women who are alleged to have approved "votes for women!" The Suffragists challenge us to produce figures showing that 90 per cent. of the organized women favor anti-suffrage and are against "votes for women." We will take up this challenge when it seems worthy of emphasis, but meanwhile we would like to challenge the Suffragists to produce the proof that "80 to 90 per cent. of the women" canvassed in campaign States have signed petitions, as alleged! We know Suffragists who have gone round with petitions who are ashamed to tell the number and proportion they got. How delightfully refreshing it would be to find a few who can say that 80 per cent. or 90 per cent. of the women canvassed signed—and then how beautiful it would be to tell just how the signatures were obtained, or how many of the slips were signed by one person! "No, madam, it doesn't mean that you indorse woman suffrage at all," glibly explains the expert suffrage canvasser, "we only want it submitted to the people. Yes, that's it, right here on this little yellow slip. Thanks." And the woman becomes one of the "enrolled" 7 per cent. who want the vote!

#### "It's a Long Way"

##### "TIPPERARY UP TO DATE"

As originated by the Ohio Society and sung by the Boston Bar Association at its annual banquet, December 28:

"We're a long way from Woman Suffrage,  
They've a long way to go;  
It's a hard road to Woman Suffrage,  
What they'd do, we do not know.  
Goodby, both Dakotas;  
Farewell, Ohio State.  
We're a long way from Woman Suffrage,  
And we'll not tempt fate."

### Agitation that Loses Suffrage Converts

UNDER the heading "Equal Suffrage Next," the *Boston Transcript* of December 24, 1914, carried the following editorial:

With the Hobson resolution out of the way, we may soon see the advocates of woman suffrage demanding their innings along a similar line. They are somewhat eagerly forcing the issue of a constitutional amendment that shall put the sexes upon an equal basis as regards the ballot. In a sense these efforts belong in the same category, that is, each is an attempt to over-ride powers which the States justly claim by the superior authority of the nation's fundamental law. It is an attempt that has developed recently, and is born of impatience over what is regarded as the slow progress of the cause by leaving it to the States for their action. But when everything is taken into consideration the progress has not been slow. It has won in the newer and more radical States of the Union and has snatched victory even from what seemed unpromising conditions.

Unlike national prohibition, it would be quite possible, were the amendment adopted, to enforce laws that would put it in operation. But after leaving to the States for more than a hundred years regulation of the conditions of suffrage, it would seem like an ominous departure from the spirit of our institutions to impose upon them a policy to which public sentiment is opposed. This is not a question of the right or wrong of the issue. It is a question of the proper way of achieving a cherished purpose. The States that are not ready to accept equal suffrage may be held back by their prejudices, but provided they are honest prejudices they are entitled to consideration. It is much better for all concerned to treat them with emollients than to attempt their removals by rough surgery.

In spite of the improved and more tolerant temper of the time toward this proposition, we doubt whether a constitutional amendment would receive the assent of the requisite number of States to pass it. The mere fact that it was a form of pressure would arouse the resentment that would otherwise remain dormant, and not only would the attempt miscarry in its main purpose, but it might retard the progress of the cause in the States themselves. Persuasion and conviction are the best instrumentalities for introducing new policies among the people of a State. Equal suffrage has advanced one stage in as old and conservative a State as Massachusetts and it has captured two other States in a little over a year. Suffrage,

male or female, is a privilege, not a right. Because it has been extended indiscriminately in the past, is poor reason for repeating the mistake in the future. When the women of any State are really ready and willing to assume the responsibilities of suffrage, we believe an enlightened public opinion will force the legislature to give them the vote. Until they obtain the privilege State by State, that privilege should not be forced on them by Federal statute. Regardless of the merits of their cause, an amendment to the Federal Constitution is the wrong way to further it. An agitation in that direction so far from winning converts to equal suffrage, loses them.

### Suffrage Vote Shows that Suffrage is Going

TO THE WOMAN'S PROTEST:

What are the actual results of the vote on the woman suffrage referendum which was brought before the people of seven States this November? We have written to the Secretaries of State of these States and have received the official figures in each instance.

Nevada voted for woman suffrage by a majority of about 2000. The census of 1910 shows 81,875 people in Nevada—fewer people than lived then in the City of Lynn in this State. The approval of woman suffrage by such a minute fraction of our country's 90,000,000 people can hardly be agreed as particularly significant. It is also true that Montana voted for woman suffrage by a majority of 3714 (Montana has a large socialist vote) in a total vote of 78,890, a somewhat attenuated endorsement.

These States, however, are but two brands from the general burning. All the other of these seven States that voted—all the larger ones—voted against woman suffrage by majorities running from substantial to overwhelming ones. "But what of these adverse majorities," we hear the Suffragists say. "They will diminish and disappear on subsequent referendums." But will they? Let us examine the very emphatic negative that Ohio gives to such assertions:

Ohio voted in 1912 on the woman suffrage question, and voted again this year. Ohio is the fourth State in the Union in population (containing nearly 5,000,000 people), and is ten times the size in human lives and importance of Nevada and Montana combined. It is a great State with fertile areas with large farming communities, and yet has also large centers of population with extensive manufacturing districts. In brief, with these factors, it is Ohio, and not a Rocky Mountain State, which is typical of the sentiment and judg-

ment of the vast majority of the people of this country. In 1912 Ohio voted against suffrage, 249,420 voting for suffrage and 336,875 against it, the majority against suffrage being 87,455. This was in 1912.

This year, two years later, Ohio voted again on this same issue. No one ever questioned the intelligence of its people; its percentage of illiteracy is less than in most suffrage States. For two years the attention of her voters has been drawn as never before to this question by a most active agitation. For two years they have had opportunity to study further its workings in the States that have adopted it. For two years they have observed the barrenness of the results of woman suffrage in California; they have seen the unusually bitter, bloody strife between capital and labor in Colorado where women have voted twenty years; they have seen the Hinky Dink aldermen of Chicago, not only unbeaten, but actually endorsed by a majority of the women voters in their districts. What has been the conclusion of this jury of voters, and what the result in Ohio of further consideration of the question?

The vote this November in Ohio was as follows: For suffrage 335,390, against suffrage 518,295, a majority against suffrage of 182,905, more than doubling the former adverse majority of 1912, an enormous increase in majority and far larger than the increase in the total vote, a result quite disconcerting to many suffrage adherents because it pales into relative insignificance their counter-claims as to the results of this year's balloting. Does the meager endorsement by two mining camp States avail against this overwhelming rejection by the populous States and by the sovereign State of Ohio, with its higher standards, a rejection that a second ballot has doubly emphasized? This second test in Ohio shows more than a growing strengthening opposition; it is concrete and irrefutable proof that the confidence of some Suffragists in the ultimate success of their efforts has no warrant in fact.

Possibly the minority of their sex, who are trying to fasten upon an unwilling majority the obligation to vote, may prevail; possibly the millions of conscientious citizens who believe from results shown that woman suffrage will only add unnecessary complications to the already vast machinery of democratic government, may be decreasing in numbers; but the acid test of votes does not point that way. Quite the contrary. Indeed, bearing in mind these referendum results, especially that following two years' further deliberation in the typical State of Ohio, can it not be rightfully claimed that woman suffrage is no longer an oncoming wave, but is now in fact a receding one?

CHANDLER BULLOCK,  
Worcester, Mass.

## NOTES AND COMMENT

Idealism seems to have passed its zenith in New Zealand, the land of fads. Prohibition has been defeated by about 100,000 votes, even the no license districts going against it.—*Exchange*.

### FEMINISM AND SOCIALISM

(A reprint in full of this article from "The Unpopular Review" for January-March, 1915, will be sent from the office of THE WOMAN'S PROTEST on receipt of six cents (6c.) in stamps.—Editor.)

THE important thing is not that some persons identify socialism with free love, but that the most authoritative Socialists we have oppose the private family because it is inconsistent with socialism. In *Women Under Socialism* Bebel leaves no doubt in the mind of any intelligent reader what he means, and he cites a German woman writer to the same effect, and he gives the reason for the dissolution of the family:

In future society there is nothing to bequeath, unless the domestic equipment and personal inventory be regarded as inheritance; the modern form of marriage is thus devoid of foundation and collapses. The question of inheritance is thereby solved, and socialism need not concern about abolishing the same. No right of inheritance can arise when there is no private property. Woman is, accordingly, free, and her children, when she has any, do not impair her freedom.

The Feminist would break down the family in order to give economic independence to woman; and the Socialist would give economic independence to woman in order to break down the family.

### BAD SEASON FOR "ISMS"

(From the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, Rep.)

Ten constitutional amendments advocated by La Follette in Wisconsin appear to have been rejected, woman suffrage found the going bad in most of the States and even the Prohibition pendulum swung backwards. The country showed a marked inclination, everywhere, to stand pat and stop taking chances with isms for a while.

Spreaders of the suffrage propaganda are very prone to tell of the blessings that will accrue to school teachers when the burden of the ballot has descended upon them. A recent investigation by the anti-suffrage bureau of information discloses the interesting fact that there are no teachers' pensions systems in Wyoming, where women have voted for forty-five years, nor in Idaho where they have voted for eighteen years. In Utah where women were enfranchised in 1896, the legislature of 1913 provided for a retirement commission, but up to date the organization has not been effected, while Washington, which has had woman suffrage for four years, voted down the teachers' pension bill at the last election.

TO the Editor of The New York Tribune:

SIR: Miss Eva Ward refuses to admit the connection between Mormonism and the spread of woman suffrage. The Mormons, however, do admit this connection. Robert E. Pratt, a Mormon missionary, in a letter dated May 20, 1913, and published in *The New York Times*, said he welcomed the charge that the Mormon Church was the originator of the votes for women idea in this country. Said he: "Utah initiated woman suffrage with her own statehood. \* \* \* We ardently hope to see the idea spread down from our mountain country even to the eastern as it has already swept to the western sea."

In *The Tribune's* account of ex-Senator Frank J. Cannon's speech against Mormonism in the West-Park Presbyterian Church last week, Mr. Cannon is quoted as saying that "politically the Mormons controlled Utah by sheer numbers; by holding the balance of power they had practical control in Idaho and Wyoming; their influence was great in Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Montana, Washington, California and Oregon." It is significant that every one of these States is a woman suffrage State except New Mexico, Montana and Nevada going for woman suffrage in the recent election.

Miss Mary Shaw says: "If Gentile men voters of the Mormon States are unable to free themselves of the Mormon power, how can the Gentile women be expected to do it—and the Mormon polygamists voting their wives solidly for the Mormon Church?" This last clause explains in full why woman suffrage has failed. Good women divide, but vice casts a solid vote. What is true of polygamy will prove true of all other forms of white slavery. Politics will never purify the world. Education and religion are the only cure for the social evil, whatever form it may take. The suffrage leaders, however, are demanding the vote for precisely this purpose.

MARJORIE DORMAN.

New York, Dec. 21, 1914.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—Urging the adoption of the French bill permitting women to vote for senators and representatives without submitting a suffrage amendment to the States for ratification, a large delegation of women representing the Federal Suffrage Association to-day appeared before the House Committee on Election of President, Vice-President and Representatives in Congress.

Representative French, of Idaho, advocated his bill and Representative Sherley, of Kentucky, spoke for the Anti-Suffra-

gists, opposing the bill on constitutional grounds.

No action was taken by the Committee on this bill.

Miss Agnes Irwin died in Philadelphia on Saturday, December 5th. Speaking in that city on the following Monday, Mrs. A. J. George said of her: "This woman, who won honorary degrees from great universities at home and abroad, 'wrote her righteous soul upon the souls of others' through the sheer force of character. We have no better type than Miss Irwin to offer as an inspiration to our young women. With knowledge to match her zeal, holding to the best traditions of the past, weighing with cautious judgment the conditions which new occasions brought to light, she gave royally of that service which knows no desire for prestige and she stood unalterably opposed to the false doctrine of those who seek to identify the work of men and women. For fifteen years Miss Irwin was Vice-President of our Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Organization. I like to think that all over this great country of ours there are women of this type who, because of rare ability and freedom from the obligation which rests upon the average woman, are rendering disinterested public service, and are rendering this effectively because they stand outside of politics with no favors to seek, determined on one thing, to make the world better and happier because they have lived in it."

"We must always reckon with humanity, unless, indeed we are orators, living in a world of words, and marshalling unconquerable theories against unconquered facts."—"Christianity and War," Agnes Repplier, *Atlantic Monthly*, January, 1915.

The recent anti-suffrage campaign in Nebraska was carried on for \$2,864, the account of all contributions being filed with the county clerk. The result in Omaha was most satisfactory. The Suffragists spent many weeks in this section and \$6,894. In spite of these efforts, the majority for us in that county was 1000.

Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, of Hartford, President of the Connecticut Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, was appointed by Governor Baldwin a delegate from Connecticut to the eleventh annual conference of the National Child Labor Committee, held January 5th-6th, at Washington, D. C.

### THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set 50 cts. Single copies 5 cts.  
Selected packages 25c.

#### PAMPHLETS

#### NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Should We Ask for the Suffrage? *Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*  
Woman's Relation to Government *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*  
New Zealand and Australia, etc.  
The Blank Cartridge Ballot *Rossiter Johnson*  
Address (Made before Constitutional Convention, 1894)  
*Hon. Elihu Root*  
Taxation and Suffrage *Frederick Dwight*  
Woman and the Law *Francis M. Scott*  
First Legislative Address *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*  
Woman Suffrage *Carl Schurz*  
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy, etc.  
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law  
Dodgers

#### NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*  
The Militant and the Child *Mrs. F. M. Scott*  
Woman's Rights vs. Woman Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*  
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc.  
*John R. Dos Passos*  
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation *Minnie Bronson*  
Wage-Earning Woman and the State *Minnie Bronson*  
The Relation of the Sexes to Government *Prof. Edward Cope*  
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question *Miss Emily P. Bissell*  
Should Women Vote? *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*  
An Open Letter to Clergymen  
Dodgers—Statistics  
Silk Pins.....10c. each Ribbon....10c. and 15c. a yard  
Celluloid Buttons.....5c. Pennants.....15c. and 25c.

#### NEW YORK STATE MEN'S ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO POLITICAL SUFFRAGE FOR WOMEN

27 William Street Room 1823 New York City  
Brief before Rules Committee, Washington, D. C., Dec. 4, 1913  
*Everett P. Wheeler*  
Questionnaire  
Women and The Vote *Everett P. Wheeler*  
Feminist Principle Biologically Unsound  
*Prof. William I. Sedgwick*

#### BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Woman Adrift (\$1.50) *Harold Owen*  
The Nature of Woman (\$1.25) *J. Lionel Tayler*  
Vocation of Woman (\$1.50) *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*  
The Business of Being a Woman (\$1.50) *Ida Tarbell*  
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage (\$1.00)  
*Sir Almroth Wright*  
*Molly Elliott Seawell*  
The Ladies' Battle (\$1.00)  
Book of Woman's Power (\$1.25)  
The Unrest of Women (\$1.00) *E. S. Martin*  
Votes for Men (50c.)  
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.)  
*Grace Duffield Goodwin*  
Woman and the Republic (25c.) *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to

#### THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

We recommend to our readers THE LIVE ISSUE, published weekly. Subscription 50c. Office, 345 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. Also, THE REMONSTRANCE; subscription, 25c.; 687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women:  
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage

*Francis Parkman*  
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage  
*Mrs. A. J. George*  
Of What Benefit to Woman?  
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage *Jeannette L. Gilder*  
Letter to Legislative Committee *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*  
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? *Frank Foscraft*  
Taxpaying Suffrage *Charles R. Saunders*  
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men  
Opinions of Eminent Persons Against Woman Suffrage  
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage *Ida M. Tarbell*  
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel  
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage  
*Mrs. George A. Caswell*

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association  
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615

687 Boylston Street

BOSTON, MASS.

Selected Packages, 25 Cents.

#### THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find \$.....for.....year's subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State .....

Subscription Rate, \$1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....